DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 083 236 SP 007 435

AUTHOR	Schwartz, Henrietta
TITLE	FTPP News Briefs. Progress Report. November, 1972.
INSTITUTION	Chicago Univ., Ill. Ford Training and Placement Program.
PUB DATE	Nov 72
NOTE	16p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	*College School Cooperation; *Inservice Teacher Education; Program Descriptions; Program Evaluation; *School Cadres; *Teacher Programs; Team Teaching; *Urban Teaching
IDENTIFIERS	Ford Training and Placement Program; FTPP

ABSTRACT

This is a progress report on the Ford Training and Placement Program as it enters its fifth year of operation in training teachers for inner-city schools. It is stated that the major achievement of the program is the effective way it has served as a linking mechanism among the university, public school system, and local school communities, especially in training professional educators as teams and in placing them as cadres in the public schools. The document describes the program operations for 1971-72, the dynamics of information retrieval (field-based staff members were required to document their experiences with the program), the major cadres, dissemination and demonstration of information, research and evaluation, and conclusions. (JA)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ftpp news briefs

THE FORD TRAINING AND PLACEMENT PROGRAM/A SOCIAL SYSTEMS APPROACH FOR TRAINING URBAN TEACHERS/THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

ED 083236

NOV 26 1973

PROGRESS REPORT

NOVEMBER, 1972

HENRIETTA SCHWARTZ

Introduction

The Ford Training and Placement Program is entering its fifth year of operation. 1971–72 represented the last full operational year of the program's efforts to address the problems of training teachers for inner-city schools.[1] Last year was the final opportunity to work with three internship cadres and six placement year cadres, to collect data on the impact of the training program for the summative evaluation, to try new program structures and processes, and to legitimate the innovations introduced by the program in the public schools and at the university. Much was accomplished; much remains to be done. External circumstances again required some changes in program direction. But the high level of co-operation between the Graduate School and the Department of Education of the University of Chicago and the administrators of the Chicago Public Schools made it possible to effect the necessary changes required by the program.

One of the major accomplishments of the Ford Training and Placement Program is the effective way in which it functioned as a linking mechanism among the University, the Chicago Public School System and several local school communities. The resources of these agencies have been co-ordinated to assist in the training of professional educators as teams and in placing them as cadres in the public schools. Retraining of experienced teachers, the training of pre-service personnel, the introduction of new instructional programs, the implementation of a transactional evaluation model, the expansion of communication and group effort among faculties and several replications of the model at other universities are among the other program goals realized during the 1971–72 year.

Some unanticipated events required a redistribution of staff services. For example, in response to the lack of placement opportunities, a thirteenth cadre was formed to take advantage of placement opportunities available at a new school. The Dyett Middle School cadre was formed in the spring of 1972, trained that summer and entered the school in September. This cadre in its first year with the program requires staff services.

During the 1971–72 year the composition of the cadres changed to include more experienced teacher interns, elements of the training programs changed to come closer to the implications of the cross-role training model, research and evaluation changed from largely observational and interview data collection techniques to instrumentation and quantitative devices and the staff of the program changed. But the program maintained its conceptual integrity. The changes must be considered part of the developmental nature of the experiment.

This report summarizes briefly the multi-faceted activities of the program from the end of the summer, 1971 to the end of October, 1972. The first section of the report summarizes the four major areas of program operations during the year. Second, descriptions of the three internship cadres, Hirsch High School, Tanner Elementary School, and Martin Luther King, Jr. High School, are presented followed by reviews of the activities of the placement year cadres. Third, a brief statement concerning the research and evaluation component of the program and the progress on the monograph is given. Fourth, dissemination and demonstration activities are detailed. Finally, the concluding statement assesses the program's activities in solving four problems and offers a perspective of the program's directions and priorities for the 1972–73 period.

Program Operations, 1971–72

The operation of the program was planned to accommodate four major thrusts during the 1971–72 year. They were:

1. Revision of the training programs in the light of the data provided by the formative evaluations done by the research and evaluation component of the program, and the documentation of the inputs and outcomes of the treatments by other staff members.

SP 007 435

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

2. Summative and quantitative evaluation of the effects of the program on participants and students.
3. Information retrieval from staff and the reduction of staff separation anxieties and staff changes.
4. Preparation of the monograph and the development of the Dyett Middle School cadre.

Revision

The press to use experiential and research data to self-correct the program in its final operational year led staff to spend a great deal of time and energy in planning for the 1971 summer program and the cross-cadre and cross-role training experiences for the Hirsch, Tanner, and King cadres. The staff efforts were rewarded when the research reports revealed that the 1971 summer training program was the most successful ever operated by the program.[2] Further evaluation indicated the same was true of the weekly cadre meetings and of the monthly cross-role training sessions. Staff felt the need to organize the material and techniques used in these activities in a form which would allow others to replicate the training program. James McCampbell, the Assistant Director, performed this heroic task; the curriculum guide and planning procedures are presented in his paper, "Training Teams of Teachers for Urban Schools: The Ford Training and Placement Program," February, 1972, mimeo. The self-directed learning experiences focused on during the cross-cadre sessions each month led to the formation of eleven special interest task groups. These cross-cadre task groups produced a number of products, curriculum materials, visual curriculum units, school evaluation training procedures and instruments for community representatives, etc.

The material proved so useful that staff time and program resources were devoted to planning follow-up activities and packaging and distributing the materials. The co-ordinating tasks have run into the current time period. These examples indicate that the plans staff made for a non-operational, reflective, year devoted to writing could not be fully realized in 1972–73. The cadre and field activities made demands staff had to heed and to which it is still responding.

Summative Quantitative Evaluation

The new research and evaluation plan for the 1971–72 year focused on the periodic collection of large amounts of quantitative data in the three schools. The design, detailed in section three, Research and Evaluation, meant a new distribution of staff time and functions. The consequences of this reallocation were felt in the lack of time available to staff for writing about their field experiences with the program except in an informational report format, rather than in the conceptual and critical way planned in anticipation of the final monograph. The data are available, but the personal interpretations and insights of more than 15 staff members will be difficult to recapture.

Dynamics of Information Retrieval

The value of having the field based staff members document their experiences with the program was recognized early in the year. The decision was made to relieve cadre liaisons and others of their field responsibilities for several weeks at a time during the spring so that they might have time to reflect and write about their activities. The mechanism was partially successful in that several documents by liaisons and process consultants were prepared for the program's data bank. However, the time constraints, the needs of the cadres for liaisons' services and the knowledge that the time for termination was approaching rapidly prevented the field based staff members, in most cases, from giving the papers the attention necessary to produce material suitable for publication.

In the early spring of the 1972 academic year, anticipated staff reductions raised individual anxiety levels and influenced the operations of the program. The staff went from twenty-two on June 10 to six by September 1, 1972. Originally, the plan was for the July, 1972 to September, 1973 period to be a "wrap-up" year devoted to the analysis of research reports and quantitative data and the writing of the final monograph. Three staff members were to perform these tasks, the Executive Director, Henrietta Schwartz, the Assistant Director, James McCampbell, and the Director of Research and Evaluation, Wayne Doyle. Mr. Doyle was offered the position of the Director of the Franklin Pierce Experimental School Evaluation Program, Tacoma, Washington, by the U.S. Office of Education. He left the Ford Program in July, 1972. Mr. Doyle was replaced by Mr. Michael Waller who is assisted by Mr. Donald Soltz. Both gentlemen are skilled researchers and have assimilated program history and operations rapidly.

The Monograph and the New Dyett Cadre

In a few short months the staff must produce a monograph. The monograph team of Schwartz, McCampbell, Waller, and Soltz has evolved a compatible, efficient, and effective modus operandi. An outline has been prepared; the tentative completion date is late spring, 1973. Additional detail concerning the monograph is given later in the report in the section on Research and Evaluation.

To service the new Dyett cadre two staff members were retained to work directly with this group; Mr. Barry Hammond is functioning as the liaison and Mr. Ronald Kimmons is filling the group process role. These experienced staff members developed the summer program for the group, operated it, evaluated it, and

provided a unique set of experiences for this novel (in program terms) group. They are dedicated, highly skilled trainers and researchers.

THE CADRES

Three new cadres began their internship year in the schools in September, 1971. The research report[3] evaluating the summer training program for the Hirsch High School, King High School, and Tanner Elementary School indicates that the overall response to the revised summer program was quite good (3.40 on a 5.00 scale)—significant at the .01 level. Overall reaction to the Ford Program correlated very highly with reaction to the summer program and with 14 other variables among which were cadre development, understanding of the cross-roles notion, participant's understanding of his role, identification of the roles for support, the format of the summer program, understanding of the developmental approach, etc. That is, a positive view of cadre development, of a participant's own role development and the learning style of the summer program correlated highly with a positive view of the Ford Program. And the reaction to FTPP among these cadre members at the end of the summer was quite positive. Out of 50 participants for whom we had complete measures, 46 gave a rating of three or better for an overall mean of 3.46.

The training inputs during the year in the weekly cadre meetings and in the cross-cadre monthly meetings worked with the same self-directed learning model used during the summer, and again participants responded positively. (The April, 1972 newsletter outlines the cross-cadre training program for the year.)[4] The inputs of the summer training program and of the staff-planned activities during the internship year are stressed because in the Ford Training Program's understanding of education as a social process, the cadre is the key mode of operation. Since the Hirsch, King, and Tanner cadres formed and began to develop during the summer program, these early experiences were critical, as they were in the history of each of the cadres involved in the program. Participants in the 1971 summer program had quite a positive overall reaction to their early group life and, indeed, their development and productivity during the year reflected these early positive experiences. Therefore, the outputs of these three cadres—Hirsch, King, and Tanner—are described in some detail.

Cadres are developmental in nature; some bloom earlier than others. But at some point in the life of each cadre, the group must resolve four to seven basic issues. The areas of common concern are:

1. the relationship of the cadre to the rest of the faculty;
2. the relationship of the cadre to the community;
3. the relationship of the cadre to the administration—a leadership and decision-making issue;
4. the degree of task accomplishment and subsequent satisfaction perceived by the group;
5. individual role competence and task completion;
6. racial issues;
7. the relationship of the cadre to the FTPP—this concern incorporates the attendant issues of cadre autonomy and program directives, research and evaluation, funds, etc.

In the descriptions of the 1971–72 cadres, the first four issues will be considered because the last three were resolved by the end of the summer program, or ground rules were established to lead to resolutions during the internship year.

The Hirsch Cadre

The activities of the Hirsch cadre are documented more completely in two reports:

1) John E. Robinson, "Program Impact at the Local School Level," a paper prepared for presentation at the AERA Annual Meeting, April 3–7, 1972, Chicago, Illinois, mimeo (Mr. Robinson served as the liaison to the Hirsch cadre).

2) Ronald Kimmons, "The Hirsch Cadre: A Year-End View," mimeo, June, 1972 (Mr. Kimmons served as the group process consultant to the Hirsch cadre).

The Hirsch cadre did well in its internship year. There were numerous problems and hurdles, but many of the conflicts were rallying points for the cadre. Though several interns in the cadre established positive relationships with non-cadre faculty, there were groups in the Hirsch faculty who perceived some members of the cadre as a threat. The reading consultant intern, a most capable, energetic, and experienced teacher, was seen by a powerful, informal sub-group as a possible replacement for the reading teacher at the school who had less training than the intern. Though the cadre provided moral and material support for the intern, the informal power group was too firmly entrenched to permit the cadre to resolve the conflict. The reading consultant intern was placed at another school at the end of the internship year.

The relationships of the cadre members to the administration were positive and co-operative. Cadre projects received support and resources from the administration. The administration used the faculty resources provided by the university to benefit the whole faculty.

The community inputs were productive and the adult educator received active support for her projects from the community representative in the cadre and from the local school council. Members of the community volunteered time to serve in the tutoring programs sponsored by the group. They served as liaison persons with the community persons from the Tanner Elementary and Cornell Elementary Schools in the organization and operation of the workshops involving parents from the three school/communities.

The Hirsch cadre planned and executed as a group five school-wide projects.

1) Reading in the Content Areas—Using the resources of the reading consultant intern, teachers were provided with training and materials to incorporate particular reading skills into subject matter instruction.
2) *Handbook for Students*—The role specialist interns, the art intern, counselors, administrators, the chairman of the Home Economics Department, the librarian, and English teachers were most actively involved in the preparation, illustration, and production of the *Handbook*. Copies were distributed to all students (sample copies are available from the FTPP office).
3) In-service Workshops—The cadre, in conjunction with University of Chicago faculty and Ford staff, organized and presented workshops in math manipulatives, reading, the use of videotape as a motivator in the classroom, visual curriculum development, etc.
4) Parent-Teacher Workshop—The adult educator intern, in cooperation with the parent representative and other faculty and cadre members, organized a series of cross-school workshops involving parents from the Hirsch and King Schools, Cornell Elementary School, and Tanner Elementary School. The purpose of the workshops was to provide parents of both elementary and high school age children with the information and skills that would enable them to help their youngsters toward greater achievement.
5) Tutoring in the Elementary School—This cross-cadre project involved using Hirsch High School students as tutors to students at Tanner Elementary School. The program functioned all year and will be continued during the 1972–73 year, again sponsored by the cadres at Hirsch and Tanner.

Individual cadre members conducted projects which involved cadre and non-cadre faculty. Special programs were instituted in chemistry, math, home economics, art, science, reading, college testing preparation, staff communication, and other areas. Under the sponsorship of Mrs. Nellie Anderson, an experienced teacher intern, the first literary magazine, *Together Forever*,[5] featuring the talents of Hirsch students, was produced and sold to faculty, parents, and students. The magazine promises to become an annual literary event supported by the school.

The major problems faced by the Hirsch cadre during the 1972–73 placement year will revolve around the question of membership and leadership. Who will the cadre offer membership to in the larger faculty? How will the group replace the human resources lost as a result of the lack of placement opportunities at Hirsch for three teaching interns and the reading specialist and the adult educator? How will the cadre reorganize itself to maximize the leadership resources in the group? The Ford staff will be working with the placement year liaison from the Hirsch cadre to assist in finding solutions to these problems.

The King Cadre

To document the numerous and varied activities of the King cadre would require a separate report and indeed there are two long documents which have provided the information summarized here. This all-experienced teacher cadre is a remarkable group and demonstrates the effectiveness of the Ford Program's selection model. From the start, the King cadre had a thrust and purpose coupled with a critical eye toward self-evaluation. They established their school-related tasks and goals early in the year, organized for action, implemented programs involving the whole faculty and student body, and in February 1972 prepared a 110-page progress report, the *King Cadre Interim Report*.[6] The report contained twenty-two individual and group reports summarizing the status of task completion. Among the dozen or more projects completed were:

1) The dedication ceremony for the new Martin Luther King, Jr. High School and the production of a commemorative handbook were organized and carried out by the group as their first major activity in October, 1971.
2) "Operation Kickoff" was a school-wide program beginning in September and running throughout the year. The purpose of the activity was to involve all departments in assigning students "to develop pride, a positive self-image, and co-operative spirit within the King community using competitive sports as a vehicle."[7] A series of school/community programs was held accompanied by fund-raising projects. Cadre members, in conjunction with non-cadre faculty, co-ordinated the activities.
3) A Co-operative Drug Education Program—Initially suggested by the teacher nurse, and joined by cadre members and teachers from other areas, a school/community drug education program was planned and conducted during the year. Resource persons from the University were utilized and a film dealing with the Black community and the drug issue was produced by the faculty and students. A two-day workshop was sponsored May 12–13, 1972 at King combining careers in medical arts and the problems of drug abuse. Community persons participated.
4) A number of individual and small group activities in reading, performing arts, team-teaching in English and French, staff development activities, biology, etc.

Perhaps one of the best ways of summarizing the accomplishments and ethos of this highly successful cadre is to quote from the reports of members of the cadre on three of the issues which have concerned all cadres at one time.

The cadre is often viewed as an elitist, isolated, threatening group by the rest of the faculty. In terms of relationships between cadre and non-cadre teachers, Richard E. Smith (Assistant Principal, King—former Forrestville cadre member) says in his paper, "Comparative Observations of Two Cadres."[8]

> Therefore, as viewed by the rest of the faculty, we (the Forrestville cadre, 1969–70) were an elitist group who had an "in" with the principal and received everything that it wanted. . . . The present King cadre "is" the faculty. Every member is at the school every day (excluding the role specialists and community person). The only persons in the present cadre new to the faculty are the role specialists . . . therefore,

the problem of isolation is non-existent. The cadre is made up of at least one member of every major sub-group in the school. There is a mixture of experiences ranging from teachers with two years of teaching experience to teachers with over fifteen years of experience. The problems of isolation, lack of communication with the greater faculty, and the threat of having to deal with new ideas and teaching methods have been eliminated.

It should be mentioned that documentary evidence was presented to support the statement that many non-cadre faculty attended the open King cadre meetings and supported cadre activities. The official membership of the group expanded from 25 to 45 during the year.

The issue of relationships with the community has been a knotty one for most cadres. Mrs. Leola Isom, one of the community representatives in the King cadre, summarized her experiences with the group in, "Report from a Community Representative"[9] in February, 1972:

> The first discussions (summer, 1971) were concerned with self-perceptions as teachers in urban schools, evaluation of role specialists, and community tour feedback. It was at this point I realized that cadre and faculty were interested in discussing the school's problems with the parents and community people.
>
> I know that the cadre cannot work miracles, but they are giving their help when they can. The King cadre has done a wonderful job for the school and the community by bringing the parents, students, and teachers together. They are willing to involve the community in school planning. The cadre has worked in the school dedication with the local school council, community people, and student body. Other projects have been Operation Kickoff, the King film, the Yearbook, Black Expo, and many more events that will help the school in many ways. All of this would not have been possible without the cadre and the Ford Program.[10]

Relationships between cadre members and the principal is an on-going issue in all cadres. The principal has a dual role in the cadre; he is an equal cadre member with unequal authority by virtue of his position as the administrative head of the school. The whole matter of leadership in the cadre is touched by the tone of the interaction between the administrator and the other members of the cadre. The King cadre was fortunate in that the principal, Charles Almo, is a sensitive, concerned, innovative, intelligent, and critical administrator. His assistant principals are much like him. In June, 1972 Mr. Almo submitted to the Ford Program an administrative report. The two assistant principals, Richard Smith and William Hunter, involved in the program presented similar reports. In his report, Mr. Almo states:

> This school year King High School was observed and evaluated by a host of professional educators. Among them were members of the Illinois State Board of Education, the Dallas Board of Education, administrators and administration students from the University of Minnesota, University of Illinois, and almost every other University within fifty miles.
>
> They came to visit the building, they left speaking about the school. Most thought that King was in the middle of an unraveling success story. They spoke of King School as being dynamic and educationally stimulating. All were impressed positively by the cadre concept and the cadre members. They viewed the cadre as the "heart" of the King "dynamo," the key to King's success. . . .
>
> I feel the King cadre did an excellent job. I state this opinion on the criteria of goals, effort, and effect. . . .
>
> Because they worked intelligently, long, and hard I felt they accomplished in one year much that would normally take at least two. Their "spade work" achievements place us in a favorable position for next school year. . . .
>
> The cadre had a great positive effect upon students in terms of what is commonly referred to as the AFFECTIVE DOMAIN. King students are happier, more self-assured people because of a number of cadre-initiated projects. I cannot say at this time with a high degree of certainty what effect the cadre has had in the area of cognition. I should be able to say more about it later. We do have some data that look promising. However, I am prepared to state that the cadre introduced innovations and induced changes that were considered impossible three or four years ago in this community.

This report has given much attention to the activities of the King cadre with good reason. It is, by all measures, one of the most successful cadres involved in the program.

The Tanner Cadre

The Tanner cadre was composed of three pre-service interns from the University, five experienced teacher interns (two from other schools), two pre-service school social workers, seven experienced teachers, one community representative, and the principal. Eight members of the cadre were new to Tanner. The total school faculty numbered 26. Early in the internship year the pre-service and the experienced teacher interns realized that placement would not be possible at Tanner. Hindsight suggested that this realization colored the attitudes of the university-based component of the cadre and the staff toward the non-cadre teachers at Tanner and, in some cases, toward the secure school-based teachers in the cadre. During the summer the cadre sponsored a few activities to which community persons and non-cadre teachers were invited. Several community persons attended, but few non-cadre teachers participated. The informal power structure on the Tanner faculty resented the non-traditional change agents and critics from the University. Consistent with the selection model of openmindedness and receptivity to change, the Ford staff selected only one of the core members of this closed, relatively rigid, informal power group for membership in the cadre.

In this case, adherence to the selection model did not attend to the political realities operating in this small faculty and may have done a disservice to the cadre. Similarly the cadre, once, twice rebuffed, withdrew to its own tight little island. A notable exception to this withdrawal were the very competent social

worker interns whose service role necessitated their reaching out to the whole faculty. In February, 1972 an FTPP staff member was asked to speak at a Tanner PTA meeting. His remarks were misinterpreted by the leaders of the informal power structure and the non-cadre and cadre faculty were further polarized. When the university-based component of the cadre plus two of the supportive school-based teachers left the school in June, 1972, the administrator and the community expressed sincere regret.

Interestingly, the cadre developed and maintained excellent supportive relationships with the community during its sometimes turbulent stay at Tanner. A dynamic community representative and extensive inputs by the liaison, the director of dissemination, and other Ford staff members enhanced the relationship.

The principal, in June, 1972, assessed the impact of the cadre in an administrative report in the following terms:

> The net effect of the FTPP was overwhelmingly positive although uneven as it impinged on various individuals and groups. There was a significant movement toward the goals of the FTPP model in the form of expanded and systematized communication, a movement toward greater utilization of non-textual instructional materials and individualization of instruction, and greater freedom among the children and teachers.

The principal was pleased with the University of Chicago faculty resources available for staff in-service sessions. The strained relationships between FTPP staff and the cadre and non-cadre faculty members did not prevent the group from planning and implementing throughout the year a most innovative cultural enrichment program which involved non-cadre faculty and many community persons.[11]

Briefly, the purposes of the cultural enrichment program were to allow children to make choices about what they would learn, to broaden the regular school curriculum experiences, to provide an opportunity for children to work in small groups with a resource person, and to utilize the talents, skills, and interests of the staff and the community. In September, 1971 an interest survey was conducted among faculty to compile a list of offerings. 15 activities were available. About 130 fifth and sixth grade students participating in the pilot program selected the activities they wished to pursue and made suggestions about other areas of interest. The first semester courses included photography, Great Books, art, girls' chorus, electronics, French, Spanish, woodworking, crocheting, and team sports. At the end of the first semester, the enrichment program was reorganized to incorporate new courses and allow the children to sample another interest if they so desired. The second semester courses which led to products were:

1) *The Tanner Newspaper*—A student-prepared, school-wide newspaper was published in spring, 1972 under the sponsorship of two cadre interns.
2) *An art exhibit*—At Tanner and at a cross-cadre meeting at the university, students exhibited samples of their work displaying an African motif. This project was sponsored by two interns in the cadre.
3) *Charm*—Girls discussed good grooming, hair, posture, and cooking and meal planning under the guidance of a school-based cadre teacher and a school-based non-cadre teacher.
4) *Spanish Handicrafts*—Under the direction of a cadre intern, students made piñatas and a variety of items. Spanish songs and phrases were learned.
5) *Electronics*—Sponsored by a school-based non-cadre teacher, students learned to make telegraph keys, electric motors, and crystal radios. Many displayed their efforts in the school science fair.
6) *Sewing*—A member of the community was recruited to teach girls how to make their own clothes and use the sewing machines procured for the school by a member of the cadre.
7) *Crocheting*—The class made scarves, hats and vests under the direction of a member of the community.
8) *Team Sports*—A non-cadre school-based teacher worked with students on basketball skills.

The faculty evaluation of the program was generally positive and the wish to have the program expanded was expressed.

A number of individual and small group projects were instituted by the cadre. The social work interns developed programs in the areas of school improvement and working to place E.M.H. students in regular classrooms for a portion of each day. Two other interns evolved a special program in science and reading. Several cadre teachers whose classes participated in an individualized reading program reported their students displayed remarkable increases in reading achievement. Two teachers in the group experimented with an open classroom structure in the primary grades. Several cadre and non-cadre teachers participated in the joint tutoring program involving students from Hirsch High School. The TTT Resource Colleague, with cadre support, established a Reading Resource Center for parents at the school. Games, books, and other materials designed to assist parents work with their children at home could be checked out by parents for a period of two weeks. The center was heavily used during the year and the cadre allocated some of its funds for additional materials.

The issue for the Tanner School is, how will the present faculty respond to any Ford cadre related projects given the attitudes of the informal power group and the fact that all of the University-based cadre members are no longer at Tanner. As a beginning, a placement year liaison has been selected and is participating in staff meetings and other program activities. The coming year will determine the lasting effects of the cadre at Tanner.

Only one of the three 1970–71 cadres operated a summer program under Ford sponsorship in the summer of 1972. The King cadre proposed a total school program in reading in the content areas.[12] The Ford Program was able to support the efforts of a five-person planning group which devised blueprints for the in-service meetings at King during the 1972–73 year.

The Placement Year Cadres

Six placement year cadres became five placement year cadres when the King cadre was formed. The Forrestville High School cadre programs (1969, 1970–71) were incorporated into the King cadre and Ford Program activities. Five other cadres were active during the 1971–72 year. Representatives of the Dunbar, Simeon, Cornell, Horace Mann, and DuSable cadres participated in the monthly cross-cadre meetings. Typically, these placement year cadre members functioned as resource persons in the special interest task groups.[13] For example, two members of the DuSable cadre served as participant consultants to the group from King and Hirsch interested in visual curriculum development in the social sciences. Community representatives from the Simeon, Horace Mann, Cornell, and Dunbar cadres assisted the community involvement group composed of role specialists and community representatives from Hirsch, Tanner, and King to design and test their school evaluation training program and questionnaire.

During the 1971–72 placement year, the Cornell cadre (second year) worked in conjunction with other faculty members on the math and reading programs planned for the intermediate grades. Teachers worked together to increase communication across grade level and subject areas, and thereby provide better articulation in the instructional program.

The Horace Mann Cadre (third year) began the 1971–72 year with support of a proposal submitted in May of 1971, with a grant from the Ford Program. The proposal, "A Multi-Curricular Approach to Reading Abilities," required the co-ordinated efforts of the total faculty. During the fall, a variety of obstacles prevented the full implementation of the reading program, e.g., loss of specialist personnel, new faculty, poor delivery of materials. An assessment of the program by the placement year liaison in February, 1972 indicated that some aspects of the program were operating well, but some of the basic components of the program, such as the in-service training and the school-wide thrust of the multi-curricular approach, were being lost. The causes tended to be beyond the control of the school and the Ford program. Expanded enrollment, faculty reassignment, and other constraints reduced the possibility of continuity in the program. The Ford staff and the Co-ordinating Committee were concerned about the expenditure of additional monies on the project and funds were frozen temporarily in February, 1972. Mrs. Beverly Daniels, the new principal, was aware of the need for total faculty training before any project could be fully implemented. So, in co-operation with the Horace Mann Community Council, she prepared a proposal for a school/community weekend residential retreat. The proposal would have used the remainder of the funds allocated to the reading project. The retreat proposal was presented to the Co-ordinating Committee in March and discussed with Mrs. Daniels at the April meeting. In May, the Co-ordinating Committee asked that the proposal be redrafted to clarify the purposes, pre-planning, and follow-up activities for the retreat before funds were committed. The school year ended without a new draft of the proposal being submitted. For the 1972–73 year some limited funds may be made available upon presentation of a new proposal from Horace Mann. In summary, the reading program operated at about half the level anticipated. The Horace Mann faculty viewed the program and the University's resources in a positive way. Horace Mann cadre members consistently displayed a willingness to participate in Ford Program activities.

The two vocational school cadres, Dunbar and Simeon (second year cadres) were active in a variety of ways in the 1971–72 year. The Dunbar cadre expanded its membership to include Mr. Richard Stephenson, the new principal of the school, who is most supportive of the cadre's programs. Cadre members worked on projects using video tape to enhance the instructional program in the areas of career counseling, reading in the content areas, etc. and on computerizing attendance procedures. Early in the 1971–72 academic year, the cadre recognized that the climate of the school and the nature of the faculty relationships were less than positive. In conjuction with the principal and other members of the faculty, cadre members surveyed the Dunbar staff to assess their response to participation in an extended staff development workshop. The focus of the workshop would be group dynamics, emphasizing the need for co-operation among the various sub-groups on the faculty. The cadre felt that the "climate of factionalism and ill-concealed prejudice . . . must begin to change before the specific programs which the cadre is promoting . . . can have any appreciable success."[14] Cadre members sought advice from the Ford staff. In March, 1972 a proposal for a weekend faculty workshop was presented to the Co-ordinating Committee. It was established that virtually the total faculty, clerks, teacher aides, the engineer, and the lunchroom manager would participate. The workshop planning group included the principal and several cadre and non-cadre faculty members. It was their feeling that a great deal of pre-planning was needed, as well as the opportunity to see what prob-

lems time would solve. Therefore, the weekend workshop was scheduled for November, 1972 on the campus of the University of Chicago. The proposal was approved and members of the Ford research and group process staff will assist the Dunbar cadre in planning, conducting, and evaluating the experience.

The Simeon cadre had flexible membership generally related to the task the group was engaged in at any time during the year. But there was a small core of constant cadre members including the principal, an assistant principal and about five to seven extremely energetic cadre teachers. The cadre met voluntarily during the summer of 1971 to plan placement year activities in the area of Reading in the Content Areas. The plan was not carried out because of some curricular activities in reading sponsored by the Board of Education and lack of support from a few cadre and many non-cadre teachers.

In September, 1971 a new proposal, Cultural Development, was adopted by the cadre. This was to be a dual approach devoted to the ethnic aspects of education as well as those general educational requirements imposed by the mainstream culture. The program was composed of several individual and small group efforts organized around the cultural pluralistic theme and scheduled to operate throughout the year. One portion of the program organized by a vocational education teacher in the cadre enlisted the services of academic subject matter teachers and persuaded them to offer mini-courses designed to prepare students for the college board examinations. Another cadre member sponsored a "helping relationship" tutoring program whereby students proficient in math tutored on a one-to-one basis students deficient in the area. Teachers assisted with diagnostic testing and tutoring. The most expansive of the programs, touching the school and the community, was in the area of music. The band projects sponsored by the Ford Program for the last two summers had a remarkable effect on the status and size of the program during the school year. The formation of the Simeon Gospel Chorus of over a hundred students was a part of the Cultural Development Program. This group and the band have become the "foremost representatives of the school in the community."[15]

Organized displays of materials and literature concerning the contributions of racial and ethnic groups to American culture were co-ordinated with the other programs. Similar activities conducted by individuals under the general theme involved speakers with expertise in ethnic folkways meeting with social studies classes, the political and economic implications of ethnicity were discussed, and minority group contributions in the vocational areas were related to the class activities in the shops. All of the above efforts were under the direct supervision of cadre members and received extensive co-operation from the administration and other interested teachers.

The Simeon cadre expanded the Cultural Enrichment activities in a proposal submitted to the Co-ordinating Committee in May, 1972 for funding during the 1972–73 year. The Co-ordinating Committee funded part of the proposal, that portion which supported the continuation of the school/community music program.[16] Other portions of the proposal were sent back to Simeon for further clarification before funds were allocated. The/Ford Staff is assisting the Simeon cadre to answer the questions raised by the Committee.

The DuSable Extended Cadre (fourth year) is the "old timer" of the cadres. Members of the DuSable cadre are most willing to serve as resource persons to new cadres and to special task groups. This was displayed in their involvement with the internship cadres during the 1971–72 year. In congruence with the plans made by the group during their summer program in 1971, two new instructional units were implemented using an interdisciplinary teaching approach in the areas of English, math and art. Four units were developed for each subject and the two which functioned during the 1971–72 academic year were Consumer Mathematics and Art Appreciation. Two of the planned units were not introduced because of central office regulations which forced the retirement and transfer of some faculty members crucial to the program. The extended illness of another faculty member impaired the program.

During the year, Project 330, a student-study lounge, was planned by the cadre and negotiated with the administration. The lounge aroused the suspicions of some faculty members and some parents. After a series of meetings with the cadre and the Ford staff, the administration, other faculty and community representatives, the lounge was opened on a trial basis in May of 1972. The project was judged successful by the faculty and the administration. Plans were made to expand the program for the 1972–73 year and they are being implemented. The DuSable cadre hopes to institute the other portions of the interdisciplinary teaching unit in the late fall of 1972.[17]

Each year the section of the progress report describing the cadre activities gets longer. One of the remarkable things about the Ford Program is the pattern of organic growth established when a cadre "clicks." The Ford staff, in 1971–72 calling upon University and public school resources, was able to provide service and maintain a direct relationship with ten cadres in nine schools, and an indirect relationship with the faculties of nine schools. A rough estimate of the number of participants in some FTPP activity would be about 200 persons contacted directly and possibly another 500 persons indirectly.

The distance traveled and the growth demonstrated between the first DuSable cadre and the last King cadre are compressed in these reports. The record shows that the program has produced the knowledge that details how to make cadres work. In that sense, the FTPP has accomplished a major goal.

It is important to note that though there have been some staff changes and though many staff members are no longer with the program, individuals who were Ford staff members developed a rare talent in their service with the program—the ability to recognize and negotiate conflict in a productive fashion and to ask serious questions about why and how this was done. The program produced by its staff development activities a group of educators[18] whose experience, expertise, and ability to distinguish scientific and technical problems from values problems represents a valuable resource.

DISSEMINATION AND DEMONSTRATION

Information about the organizations and personnel participating in all aspects of the program has been extensive. This component of the program was active, almost to the point of overcommitment, during the 1971–72 period. At least one major program presentation was scheduled from November, 1971 to June, 1972, in addition to the on-going weekly and monthly activities. These included:

1) the preparation and distribution of news releases;
2) the *FTPP News Briefs* monthly newsletter with a circulation list of 1,000;
3) the revision and packaging of program literature;
4) the responses to requests for information about the program;
5) the scheduling and arranging of TV programs, like, "Perspectives," a half-hour program shown on A.B.C.'s channel 7, and panel presentations on radio, half-hour "talk" shows aired on the A.B.C. network stations, concerning the program. Four of these were done; two TV presentations and two radio shows;
6) the assistance provided to staff and program participants to write about their experiences with the program;
7) the regular and positive contacts maintained with community persons and organizations involved or interested in the program;
8) the consultations and demonstrations organized for educators from the U.S. and abroad who came to see the program in action;
9) the production of audio-visual materials describing the program; and
10) the promotion of program activities like the monthly cross-cadre meetings which were open to communities and public school personnel across the metropolitan Chicago area.

In the fall of 1971, staff members described the program to several local organizations. The director was a featured speaker at the annual banquet meetings of the Lakefront Council and the Citizens Schools Committee. She also spoke about the program to the Visiting Committee for the Department and Graduate School of Education of the University of Chicago. The staff presentation of the program at the National Council of Social Studies Convention in Denver, Colorado in November was well received. Interest in the program was high and staff members contacted approximately three hundred educators and provided them with firsthand explanations and literature concerning the program. The proposal submitted to the U.S. Office of Education to train researchers for urban schools prepared by the Ford staff was accepted in revised form, was funded and is now operating under the sponsorship of the Department of Education.

Through the efforts of Mr. Mike Boos of the University's Office of Public Information, feature articles appeared in all major Chicago newspapers in the late fall and early winter. A series of articles describing the Ford Program ran in the *Chicago Defender*.

The Ford staff functioned as consultants to the College of Education at Northern Illinois University and assisted in the drafting and revisions of Northern Illinois University's proposal to replicate the program. Many trips were made between DeKalb and Chicago during the winter of 1972. In February the proposal was presented to the Superintendent of Public Instruction and the Director of the Board of Higher Education for the state of Illinois. The presentation was made jointly by Mrs. Schwartz, Mr. Brady, and Dean J. Alan Thomas of the University of Chicago and Dean James Heald and Assistant Dean Samuel Davis of Northern Illinois University. It was well received and planning grant funding was promised by the directors of the two state agencies.

January of 1972 saw the completion of our second audio-visual production describing the conceptual and operational aspects of the Ford Training and Placement Program. "A Bold Step In Inner-City Education" is a tape-slide presentation in two forms. The nine minute video-tape cartridge format, used by the ERIC dissemination center at conferences, was first presented to the Association of Teacher Educators Conference in Chicago in February. The presentation led to requests for literature describing the program from more than 100 persons. The second form of, "A Bold Step in Inner-City Education" is a 20-minute tape-slide presentation used by the staff members for workshop and conference activities. Both the longer and the shorter versions of the audio-visual presentation have been sent out to other agencies interested in the program. The tape-slide presentation and accompanying literature frequently eliminated the need to send a staff member

out of town to describe the program. Also in January the staff became the principal authors of the District 13 cadre proposal to be submitted for Title III funding to the Board of Education in early spring, 1972.

A two-hour session was devoted to the program at the annual meeting of the ATE and AACTE organizations in Chicago in February. The interest evidenced in the program's selection model was high. In response to a request from one of the conferees, Richard McNair, consultant to the Teacher Preparation and Licensing Commission of the State of California a paper, "Training Teachers for Inner-City Schools: The Development of a Selection Model."[19] was prepared and sent to the commission along with a set of recommendations for implementing the Stull Bill, (AB293), 1971 California Legislature.

The annual meeting of the North Central Association in Chicago in March featured a joint presentation by Henrietta Schwartz and Samuel Davis, focusing on the benefits of inter-agency cooperation. The development of the relationship between the FTPP of the University of Chicago, a private research-oriented university, and the College of Education of Northern Illinois University was traced and the undergraduate replication of the FTPP to be operated at a state university was described. The paper presented by Mrs. Schwartz was published in the Spring, 1972 issue of the *North Central Association Quarterly*.[20]

At the beginning of the 1972 year consideration was given to the program's sponsorship of another conference similar to those operated in April, 1970 and 1971. Staff decided that, in terms of cost-effectiveness, it was more efficient for the program to seek participation in regional and national conferences sponsored by professional associations. Reviewing the range of activities and the number of persons and agencies reached through these activities, the staff decision was a sound one. In April, the suggestion was made that a curriculum demonstration workshop be sponsored at M. L. King High School, much like the workshop conducted in June, 1970 at Horace Mann Elementary School. However, the anticipated early closing of the schools announced by the Chicago Board of Education led the staff to decide the proposed workshop would be an imposition on the participants.

The month of April, 1972 featured four major presentations. A two-hour symposium devoted to the program at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association involved six members of the Ford staff and Dr. Curtis Melnick, Area Associate Superintendent of the Chicago Public Schools. Professor Mark Krug, Graduate School of Education, and Professor Donald Erickson, Midwest Administration Center, both from the University of Chicago, also participated. The content of the session is summarized in the AERA abstracts.[21] The paper presented by Mrs. Schwartz for the AERA meeting has been abstracted for publication in the November issue of the ERIC publication *Research in Education*.[22]

Later in the month, the Ford Program was described to and discussed with a wide variety of teacher educators in clinics sponsored by Teacher Corps and AACTE at East Tennessee State University, Johnson City, Tennessee, the University of Tennessee, Knoxville, Tennessee, and at the University of Atlanta, Atlanta, Georgia.

During the year, staff members consulted with a number of visitors affiliated with universities and government agencies from Belgium, Japan, Israel, Australia, New Zealand, and Britain. In August the director visited with persons engaged in urban education in Britain. Visits included the Schools Council in London, and the Educational Priorities Act Programs under William Halsey at Oxford. Interviews were conducted with Professor Maurice Craft at the University of Exeter, Professor Dany McDowell at York University, and Professor John Raynor at the Open University in Bletchley.

In accordance with the staff reductions planned for the 1972–73 year, Mr. Brady, the director of dissemination and demonstration, left the program staff in August to pursue his doctoral degree at the University of Wisconsin. Consequently, the nature and number of dissemination activities will be changed during the 1972–73 year. Projected activities include the bimonthly publication of the newsletter, periodic news releases, revision of some program literature, consultations with agencies replicating the program and selected appearances by staff to present the program to those interested in research and replication.

Proposals for sessions have been accepted by the Association of Teacher Educators for presentation in February, 1973, by the American Educational Research Association in March, 1973, and tentatively by the Association of School Administrators in March, 1973.

The most vital event in the dissemination of the program will consume the majority of staff time and energy in 1972–73. The writing and publication of the monograph should synthesize and enhance the already extensive efforts of the dissemination component of the program.

During the 1971–72 year the FTPP moved from a profile of "low visibility" to one of attracting interest on the national scene. The "show and tell" goal outlined in last year's progress report was achieved.

RESEARCH AND EVALUATION

A complete description of the research and evaluation design for the 1971–72 year is given in Wayne Doyle's paper on Transactional Evaluation.[23] A brief description of the research design is presented here.

Over the five years of the program, Research and Evaluation has been involved in two major tasks that served different functions in the program: (1) the structured observation of the on-going operation of the program in order to provide feedback for intervention and correction when needed and, (2) the development and implementation of a research design to assess the outcomes of the Ford Program as a model for training teachers for inner-city schools.

At present, the evaluation of different aspects of the program is completed. These reports were authored by Research Assistants on the Ford Staff. The data were collected by participant and non-participant observations, by interviews, by questionnaires, and by historical documentation of the program. These reports reflect the problems and issues that arose in cross-role training, in the role specialists program, in cadre development and placement, and finally in establishing viable relationships between the University, the school system, and the community. The descriptions and interpretations in these reports indicated the level of success of each program component in achieving the goals of the program. The conclusions presented in these reports as well as the resulting modifications in the operation of the program will be indicated in the final evaluation.

The second task, research on FTPP outcomes, is still in progress. The research design developed by Research and Evaluation was an attempt to establish linkages between program inputs and proposed outcomes. Specifically, the research model was developed to assess the influence of three factors on final outcomes: (1) the initial selection of people into the program; (2) the training provided by Ford; and (3) feedback in the work situation.

The first objective was to define the appropriate variables in such a design. Because the training model emphasized changes in orientation there were pre- and post-test measures of attitudes and classroom performance of teachers participating in the research. Teachers were asked to respond to six attitudinal measurements: (1) attitude toward research; (2) willingness to try innovative curriculum ideas; (3) beliefs about the teaching-learning process; (4) openness to synthesizing new knowledge into a belief system; (5) openness to new action patterns for the solution of problems; and (6) psychological distance one established between oneself and one's co-worker.

For classroom performance, we assumed that the analysis of verbal behavior was the best indicator of teaching methods and goals. We observed the verbal interaction between students and teachers using two dimensions of verbal behavior. In addition, there are pre- and post-test scores of student attitudes toward school, toward the classroom, and their self-concept.

At present, all pre-test scores have been recorded and reported back to the teachers. Post-test scores are now being recorded and will be sent to all participants in January, 1973. The first draft of the analysis and interpretation of data will be completed by March and with a final report due in April, 1973.

The final evaluation of FTPP should reflect processes and outcomes of the implementation of a conceptual model for training teachers. Because the program was experimental, one could anticipate unforeseen developments and subsequent modifications along the way. The sequential nature of the work of Research and Evaluation attests to the validity of this assumption. First, there were observations and descriptions of the operation of the program as it was developed from the conceptual model. Next, on the basis of this information, the over-all goals of the program were refined, providing clearer definitions of anticipated outcomes and the procedures for realizing such outcomes. In the final year of the program, it was possible to assess some of the effects of the training program on educational institutions. The findings should be an important contribution to knowledge about teacher-training at a time of crisis in urban education.

Preparation of the final monograph summarizing the outcomes of the experiment called the FTPP is the chief task of all staff members during the 1972–73 year. The primary responsibility for work on the monograph rests with four staff members, Henrietta Schwartz, James McCampbell, Michael Waller, and Donald Soltz. In a series of lengthy meetings, a detailed outline was formulated, a general chapter format evolved, and writing tasks were distributed. The monograph will be organized into approximately sixteen chapters. A schedule of task completion dates is being compiled and the anticipated date for completion of the first full draft is April, 1973. We have talked with Professor J. W. Getzels about the possibility of doing a foreword for the monograph. He looks upon the idea favorably and will make a final decision after he reads the first draft of the manuscript.

The time press is great. In discussions with Dean J. Alan Thomas concerning the advisory function, the suggestion was made that individual advisors, rather than a committee, be consulted for their reactions to the monograph. The staff accepted the suggestion as a more efficient and effective way to proceed. The advisors, faculty members from the University of Chicago, and administrators from the Chicago Public Schools, are looked to for information and criticism on portions of the monograph related to their knowledge of the program. The staff will discuss and respond to individual critiques within the framework of the thrust of the monograph.

At some point in the late winter, publishers will be contacted to gauge their interest in publishing the work. A small fund has been budgeted for duplication

of a limited number of copies by the Ford Program. This will fulfill the requirement of the Ford Foundation for a final report in October, 1973.

CONCLUSION—PROBLEMS, SOLUTIONS, AND PERSPECTIVES

Problems and Solutions

In the 1971 Progress Report four problems were identified as requiring staff attention. They were (1) the placement of interns and role specialists; (2) the propagation of the program in other universities and school systems; (3) the publication of the knowledge produced by the program and (4) the prolongation of the program internally and externally.

Placement

The apparent current surplus of teachers influenced the direction of the program last year. The Chicago Public Schools had long waiting lists of qualified persons in almost all subject areas. Financial constraints and declining student populations in the city displaced a number of certified teachers, and these "supernumerary" teachers became the chief competitors for the few vacancies available in the schools. Teachers no longer refused assignment in inner-city schools. A job in any school was preferable to no job at all.

At the same time, universities were losing federal funding and other forms of student support. Fewer graduate students were given fellowships and enrollments in M.A.T. programs dropped. The University of Chicago was no exception. Enrollment of pre-service persons in the University's teacher education program was reduced by 50%. This meant that the Ford Program had a much smaller pool from which to select pre-service interns for participation in the program.

These two factors combined with the program's very positive associations with experienced teacher interns led to a variety of responses to the group placement problem. First, in those cases where the cadre was composed of experienced teacher interns and pre-service interns, such as the one at Hirsch High School, the Ford staff negotiated with the Associate Superintendent of Area A, Dr. Curtis Melnick, the district superintendent and the principal of the school to achieve placement at the school for the pre-service interns for the 1971–72 school year. This proved to be only partially successful because the school could not accommodate two interns in social studies, one in art, and one role specialist. The teaching interns eventually were placed; the role specialist, an adult educator, was not employed by the Board of Education.

Second, the program created the all experienced teacher cadre, for the reasons described in the last progress report, at Martin Luther King, Jr. High School. Nine members of the group of twenty-six were experienced teacher interns, certified teachers assigned to King working half-time at the school and at the University the rest of the time completing their masters' degrees. The King cadre included one pre-service social work intern, one social psychological specialist, and one adult educator. The role specialists were the only placement problems at King High School, and our negotiations with the Associate Superintendent of Area B, Julien Drayton, and the Board of Education may result in the employment of the social worker at the school. The prospect of the Board of Education's employing the other two persons is bleak, but discussions are continuing.

Third, it was clear by late fall, 1971, that the interns in the cadre at Tanner Elementary School could not be absorbed in the staff structure. Enrollment at the school was declining. So in December of 1971 the Dean of the Graduate School, Ford staff members, and the Associate Superintendent for Teacher Personnel, Dr. Otho Robinson, met with the Superintendent, Dr. James Redmond, and the Deputy Superintendent, Mr. Manford Byrd, to discuss the placement problems faced by the program. The meeting resulted in a commitment from Dr. Redmond, the Superintendent of the Chicago Public Schools, to maintain the integrity of the group placement component of the program. The interns who could not be placed at Tanner Elementary School and Hirsch High School would be placed as a group in one of the new middle schools scheduled to open in the summer of 1972. This arrangement led to the formation of the thirteenth Ford Cadre, the Walter H. Dyett Middle School Cadre. The Dyett Middle School is a year-round school operating on the 45–15 plan and organized into four houses, each staffed by 16 professionals servicing about 350 children. The age range of the students is from 11 to 13 covering grades 6 through 8. The school was designed to be used as an open space facility, featuring team teaching, individualized instruction, learning resource centers and many other innovations. The membership of the cadre includes four teachers who were in the Tanner Elementary School cadre, three teachers who were with the Cornell and Hirsch cadres, and four experienced teachers from the Dyett faculty. Also included are several role specialists, the social worker from Tanner, a counselor, an assistant principal, the principal, and a community representative. To complete the cadre the Ford staff selected four pre-service teachers from degree programs at the university.

The creation of the cadre at Dyett resolved the placement problem for most of the pre-service teaching interns from Tanner and Hirsch. However, it did create another set of problems not fully anticipated by the program staff. Originally, no training program had been planned for new cadres for the summer of 1972, nor

had it been anticipated that staff time would have to be spent on selecting persons to staff new cadres. The group created for the Dyett School obviously needed some training inputs if it was going to function effectively in the new setting. This meant that staff time which could have been spent on synthesizing the experiences with the twelve previous cadres had to be diverted to selecting cadre members, negotiating with the principal, arranging placement, planning a summer training program, reallocating funds and resources to support the cadre during its first year, and staffing the cadre. The Dyett group was a placement cadre in that all members of the group were full-time staff members employed by the Chicago Board of Education, but the group had many of the same needs as an internship cadre. The Dyett cadre had to develop group support, maximize resources, resolve interpersonal conflicts, learn to work as a team, improve role competence, understand the social system of the new school and withstand the trauma that goes with the opening of any new facility. Recognizing these needs, the decision was made to operate a three-week summer training program and retain on the staff a liaison and group process consultant who would provide services to the Dyett cadre during the 1971–72 school year. The implications of this decision will be clearer as the year advances.

It should be mentioned that of the twenty-two experienced teacher interns who began degree programs in the 1971 academic year at the University of Chicago, twenty have finished their degrees, one is almost finished, and one dropped out of the program because marriage necessitated relocation out of the state. The contributions made to the cadres, the schools, and the program by this group of participants have been more positive, more frequent, and more productive than any other group involved in the program. The combination of experienced teacher interns, pre-service interns, school-based teachers and role specialists, given our selection criteria and appropriate staff inputs, seems to produce an effective and efficient group.

Propagation

As indicated in previous sections of the report, the program achieved heightened visibility through the efforts of the dissemination and demonstration component. Participation in regional and national conferences, consultation services provided directly to institutions interested in replicating the program, preparation of proposals for projects directly related to the program's concepts and operations and other activities have had a multiplier effect. It is reasonable to anticipate that all or portions of the program will be replicated at the University and at other locations. We are aware of adoptions of the model under way at Rutgers University, Northern Illinois University, Temple University, and LaTrobe University in Australia. There may be others we are not yet aware of.

Publication

Although the written records of the Ford Training and Placement Program fill many volumes, few articles have been published. We decided to wait until we had enough data and trials to know what elements of the program made a difference. The 1971–72 period was a particularly prolific one. The articles and reports produced by staff members are shown in the Appendix.

Prolongation

The last issue was considered from two aspects, external replication by other universities and school systems and internal impact and continuation of the program at the University of Chicago and in the Chicago Public Schools and their communities. The external continuation has already been discussed. Therefore, the emphasis in this portion of the report will be on the impact of the program on the agencies involved and the prospects for the continuation of program activities in Chicago.

A specific charge in the Getzels' article "is the establishment of demonstration and induction schools in the districts of the inner-city as a part of the urban school system."[24] The Ford Program has established and maintained relationships with a dozen demonstration and induction schools in Chicago over the last four years. During the 1971–72 year the staff considered the possibility of designating *one school* as the Demonstration School, one which would maintain a continuous relationship with the Graduate School of Education of the University and would serve as a training site for groups of pre-service interns and as a project, curriculum development and dissemination center for the school system, the community, and the university after the Ford Program was phased out. The staff prepared a statement of criteria for the selection of the school, screened the schools which had hosted Ford cadres, and talked with principals of cadre schools to gauge the willingness to participate. Considering all variables (and the successful experiences described in previous reports) two sites seem most appropriate for a demonstration school—DuSable High School and Martin Luther King, Jr. High School. King High School was the final choice of the staff. A proposal outlining the long-term relationship envisioned was prepared in cooperation with the cadre, the principal, and the faculty of King High School. The director of the Ford Program presented the proposal to the Graduate School of Education in May, 1972. The proposal was approved in principle with the stipulation that implementation would depend on securing funds to operate the activity. It was estimated that approximately $30,000.00 per year would be required. In this period of diminishing

support, the Graduate School of Education did not feel it could allocate scarce resources to the Demonstration School notion. The staff did not see its role as one of fund seeking to implement the proposal. The staff did attempt to assist the King High School cadre to secure funds to support an ambitious school-wide, two-year reading proposal involving representatives from all departments in the school in the planning and operation of the project. Seed funds were allocated to the cadre to get the program off the ground and to enhance what had become a continuing positive relationship between individual King High School teachers and university faculty members. The arrangement is not seen as a substitute for the Demonstration School, but rather as a strategy for keeping visible the mutual benefits to both organizations in pursuing cooperative programs.

External constraints influenced the Graduate School of Education's Advisory Committee's response to a second proposal presented by the staff. In December, 1971 the staff, concerned with the problem of what components of the training program would be maintained after the Ford Program terminated in June, 1973, proposed that the Graduate School assume the responsibility of forming and operating one secondary school cadre with pre-service and experienced teacher interns each year. The cost was estimated at approximately $10,000.00 per year. Again, the faculty was willing, but the fiscal support was weak.

The staff still feels strongly that what has been successful in the program should not end with the departure of funds and staff. And indeed if one asks which elements of the program will be continued at the University, one can list a number of significant effects. Let me mention a few of the more obvious ones:

1) Since the inception of the Ford Training and Placement Program in 1967, one can trace both in the Graduate School of Education and in the Department of Education a greater urban field orientation in the kinds of new programs instituted and in the faculty ethos.

2) The creation and expansion of the M.S.T. experienced teacher degree program was a direct outcome of the Graduate School of Education's experiences with the Ford Training and Placement Program and later the TTT and the Teacher Leadership Development programs.

3) The new program being proposed by the Graduate School of Education to form curricular teams to engage in mid-career intervention and training is an example of the inter-agency cooperation exemplified by the Ford Training and Placement Program. The program will involve in its planning and operation staff representing several public school districts, the Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction, several local communities, and the University of Chicago.

4) The increased involvement of Graduate School of Education faculty members in workshops, in-service sessions, and other activities in the Chicago Public Schools has been spearheaded and facilitated by the Ford Training and Placement Program.

5) The Ford Training and Placement Program demonstrated that the University of Chicago could work cooperatively with the Chicago Public Schools to the benefit of both agencies. The program's success encouraged the Department of Education's Midwest Administration Center actively to seek co-operative arrangements with the Chicago Public Schools. The E.P.D.A. Administrative Internship Program seeks to train pre-service principals in the schools. The Doctoral Fellowships in Educational Administration funded by the Ford Foundation offer students a wide range of clinical experiences in urban schools.

6) Professor Mark Krug commented in a meeting of the American Educational Research Association last spring that his participation in the Ford Program turned his attention to the special curricular and instructional problems of inner-city education. This interest opened a new area of research for him and other faculty members in the Graduate School of Education.

7) As a result of the experiences of the Research and Evaluation component of the Ford Training and Placement Program, a proposal was submitted to the U.S.O.E., the purpose of which was to train experienced professionals to do research in urban schools. The Ford Program had evolved a successful model and a set of techniques which effectively trained our evaluation staff. The need for trained urban school evaluators is great. The proposal was funded and is currently in operation under the sponsorship of the Department of Education.

One must ask what will be the impact of the Ford Training and Placement Program in the urban public schools who participated in the program? The final results are not compiled, but some effects are apparent.

1) One must again refer to the ethos of cooperation, support, and a willingness to participate in joint ventures exhibited by administrators in the Chicago Public Schools. Each of the specific programs mentioned earlier requires the approval and active involvement of the personnel in the Chicago Public Schools.

2) The proposal suggesting the formulation of the District 13 cadre (described on page five of last year's progress report) grew out of the recognition on the part of the District Superintendent, administrators, teachers, community persons, and others involved in the DuSable cadre that the cadre mechanism and the program's concepts and operations are workable ways to train, retrain, and stimulate teachers in inner-city schools. The District 13 Cadre planning group is promoting funding of the proposal under the Title III programs of the Board of Education.

3) FTPP required that social work interns be placed where they trained. The Chicago Public Schools recognized the benefits of having school social workers who have trained with the cadres placed on a full-time basis at the schools or in the districts where they trained. Whenever possible, Mr. John Nebo of the Division of Social Work of the Chicago Public Schools has achieved this placement—at Horace Mann Elementary School, Kenwood High School, Dyett Middle School, and in District 27.

4) The individual school/communities who have worked with the Ford Program have developed an active interest in action research and program evaluation.

Teachers and principals who may have been resistant to research initially have acquired understandings and skills which lead them to call upon the university and FTPP for assistance in doing research. Further, the University enjoys more open access to the schools for research activities.

5) In cadre schools, there is a greater recognition of the importance of good communication and collegial relationships. The cadre and cross-role training mechanisms provide models for conflict resolution among faculty persons. For example, the Dunbar expanded cadre (now in its third year with the program in concert with the rest of the faculty and the principal and community representatives) is holding a November weekend retreat much like those the Ford Program ran at the beginning of each summer training program. The Ford staff will participate and communication issues will be processed.

6) The special projects sponsored by the FTPP have been incorporated into the structure of the school programs. Examples of this are the Ford sponsored Simeon Summer Program in 1971 which led to the formation of the band, the band parents club, the school-sponsored summer music program, etc.; the production of math materials at DuSable in 1969–70 which led to dissemination of the materials city-wide by the Board of Education; the Ford-sponsored Hirsch literary magazine which will become a school-sponsored publication.

The program can be prolonged in a variety of ways, probably not in the way it was structured and functioned for the last four years. The power of the conceptual model and the knowledge developed by the FTPP about the appropriate way to implement the model insure the continuation of the cadre as a vehicle for training educators.

PERSPECTIVES

Looking forward to the 1972–73 year, the monograph looms large as the major task for the program staff. All other activities must be subordinated to the completion of the document by June, 1973. This is not to say that other program functions will be overlooked. Among the tasks for the coming year are: (1) the performance of maintenance operations, (2) the preparation of additional internal reports, e.g., the explication of the group process consultant role, the development of the Dyett cadre, the revisions of pending proposals, (3) the necessary rewriting leading to the journal publication of existing documents, (4) the participation in selected dissemination activities, e.g., conferences, newsletters, consultations, (5) the provision of training and inservice inputs for the Dyett cadre and eight placement year cadres and (6) the development and activation of strategies promoting the prolongation of the program and the further investigation of the model.

The previous progress report predicted that "1971–1972 will be a 'bumper' year." The evidence suggests that the prediction became a reality. The prediction for the coming year is this: 1972–73 will be a prolific and summative year.

Articles, Reports, and Materials Produced by the Ford Training and Placement Program

Brady, Thomas, *Impact of a Model on Curriculum*, presented at the NCSS Conference, Denver, Colorado, November, 1971, ditto.

The Conference Reporter, Spring, 1971, printed.

Doyle, Wayne, *Address to Second Annual Orientation Dinner*, October 13, 1971, mimeo. "Transactional Evaluation" in Robert Rippey's book, *Studies in Transactional Evaluation*, McCutchan Publishing Company, Berkeley 1972 (in press).

Friedman, Lorraine, "School Social Work Training and Supervision in the Ford Training and Placement Program," mimeo.

Gaus-Woollen, *Evaluation of the 1971 Summer Program*, July 7, 1972, mimeo.

Hammond, Barry, *How Team Teaching Might Be Organized*, February 2, 1972, ditto. *Some Expectations on Year-Round Schooling at Dyett*, June 12, 1972, ditto. *Why Community People Must Solve Educational Problems and How It Might Be Done*, 2/16/72, ditto.

Kimmons, Ron, *Development of a Teaching Approach Through A Visual Medium and Inquiry Model*, September 15, 1972, ditto. *The Hirsch Cadre: A Year-End View*, June, 1972, ditto.

King Cadre Interim Report, February, 1972, mimeo.

McCampbell, James F., *Training Teams of Teachers for Urban Schools: The Ford Training and Placement Program*, February 25, 1972, ditto. *A Transactional Style of Organization Process*, October, 1972, ditto.

Newsletters, December, 1971—July–August, 1972, printed.

Osborne, Sidney, *Some Perceptions of the Cadre Liaison Role at Martin Luther King High School*, February, 1972, ditto.

Progress Report, November, 1972, ditto.

Robinson, John, *Program Impact at the Local School Level*, April 4, 1972, ditto.

Sawyer, John, *A Consultant's Perspectives on the Martin Luther King Cadre of the Ford Training and Placement Program*, 1971–72, July 20, 1972, draft. *Institutional Relationships in FTPP, University, Board, and Community*, July 20, 1972—draft.

Schwartz, Henrietta, "A Social Systems Approach to Training Teachers: The Ford Training and Placement Program," Autumn, 1971, *Education at Chicago*, Vol. 1, No. 2. "An Experiment in Training Teachers for Inner-City Schools: A Social Systems Approach in the Ford Training and Placement Program," *North Central Association Quarterly*, Spring, 1972, Vol. XLVI, No. 4. "A Model for Interagency Co-operation Between Public and Private Agencies," to be presented at the AACTE-ATE Conference, February, 1973 in Chicago with Jack Davis. "Training Teachers for Inner-City Schools: The Development of A Selection Model" presented at ATE-AACTE Conference, February 23, 1972, ditto. "Elitist Institution and Practical Programs and Problems," presented at program sponsored by Region IX of the U.S. Office of Education and the Berkeley United School District in San Francisco, California, February 8–9, 1971. "Are Teachers Being Trained to Teach Reading?" addressed to Citizens Schools Committee Annual Awards Dinner, October 9, 1971. "Cultural Concepts in the Analysis of an Experimental Program: The Ford Training and Placement Program," presented at AERA Annual Meeting, April 5, 1972.

Tape-Slide Presentation, "A Bold Step in Inner-City Education," 9-minute and 21-minute versions, February, 1972.
Thompsett, Bruce, "Impact of Cadres on School Settings," September, 1971, mimeo.
Walker, Juliet, *The Role of an Historian in an Experimental Education Program*, presented at the National Council of Social Studies Conference, Denver, Colorado, November 26, 1971, ditto. *Phase II of History, Conclusion of History*.
Wilson, Yolande, *A Case Study of Group Development*, presented at the National Council of Social Studies Conference—Denver, Colorado, November 26, 1971, ditto.

FOOTNOTES

[1]The concepts, operations and goals of the program are fully described in an article by H. Schwartz, "A Social System Approach to Training Teachers for Urban Schools: The Ford Training and Placement Program," *Education at Chicago*, Autumn, 1971.

[2]See Kathy Gaus-Woollen's report, "Evaluation of the 1971 Summer Program, Ford Training and Placement Program,". June, 1972, mimeo.

[3]*Ibid*.

[4]The May and June, 1972 issues of the *FTPP News Briefs* provide additional information on the program.

[5]Sample copies are available from the FTPP office.

[6]*The King Cadre Interim Report*, February, 1972, mimeo.

[7]*King Cadre Interim Report*, 1972, mimeo, p. 7.

[8]*Op. Cit.*, p. 108, 109.

[9]*King Cadre Interim Report*, *Op. Cit.*, pp. 86–87.

[10]*Ibid.*, p. 86.

[11]A complete description of the program is available in the FTPP *News Briefs*, Volume III, No. 7, April, 1972, pp. 8–9.

[12]Reading in the Content Areas" a proposal submitted to the FTPP by the Martin Luther King, Jr. cadre and faculty, May, 1972, pp. 92.

[13]Special interest task groups were composed of individuals from several cadres interested in working on the same project. They met together once a month at cross-cadre meetings and weekly as a task group.

[14]Dunbar cadre proposal, March, 1972, mimeo.

[15]Simeon-Ford Cadre Activities, mid-year report, Jan. 1972, mimeo.

[16]The evaluation of the music programs sponsored by the Ford Program during the summers of 1971 and 1972 appears in the July–August, 1972 issue of the *FTPP News Briefs*.

[17]Another member of the DuSable Cadre, Mr. Luke Helm, was selected as an outstanding teacher for the 1971–72 year by the Citizens Schools Committee of Chicago. Three teachers from this cadre have been selected for this award.

[18]Almost 100 in number with no more than 5 percent ratio of failure, in the director's judgment.

[19]Henrietta Schwartz, "Training Teachers for Inner City Schools: The Development of a Selection Model," March, 1972, mimeo.

[20]H. Schwartz, "An Experiment in Training Teachers for Inner-City Schools: A Social System's Approach in the Ford Training and Placement Program," *The North Central Association Quarterly*, Vol. XLVI, No. 4, Spring, 1972.

[21]AERA Abstracts, 1972

[22]H. Schwartz, "An Experiment in Training Teachers for Inner-City Schools: A Social System's Approach in the Ford Training and Placement Program," *Research in Education*, ERIC publications, November, 1972.

[23]Wayne Doyle, "Transactional Evaluation" in Robert Rippey's *Studies in Transactional Evaluation*, McCutchan Publishing Company, Berkeley, 1972 (in press).

[24]Getzels, "Education for the Inner-City," p. 293.